

City of Binghamton
Commission on Architecture and Urban Design
24 February 2015
Minutes

Date: 24 February 2015

Location: Planning Department Conference Room

Members Present:

J. Darrow
M. Atchie
J. Smith
S. Edwards
K. Ellsworth
P. Klosky

Others Present:

R. Murphy
J. Matzo
M. Enoch
M. Giurastante

Absent:

M. Mauro

Mr. Ellsworth calls the meeting to order at approximately 12:00 PM.

The approval of the minutes was deferred.

Items Heard:

71 Court St.:

K. Ellsworth introduces the renewal application, presented by applicant, Mr. Urso. The first plan went through during 2011. There is discussion regarding the sidewalk and outdoor seating and the accuracy of current drawing, which is seemingly not up-to-date. This is the fourth year that this application is renewed, so next year begins a new application process. Darrow makes a motion to renew the application, provided a new design is submitted detailing altered bollards, chains and dimensions. Klosky seconded the motion. The motion was carried 6-0-0. The project was APPROVED.

7 Court St. – Citrea Outdoor Café Permit:

The applicant, Victoria Alt, appears to discuss the addition to her restaurant, Citrea. Darrow clarifies that CAUD had already approved the door during last year's meetings. The pertinent issue was the additional outdoor seating and the size of the pedestrian walkway. According to the City Engineers, the distance between the bollards and the building is 11-feet. The distance between the bollards and the end of the table is 5-feet, which meets the standard for the café permit. It is clarified that pedestrians walk on the other side of the bollards. Enclosure was then discussed. The bollards need to be roped off due to liquor authority regulations. M. Atchie made a motion to approve the application provided the applicant uses the black stands with the rope similar to the movie theater roping on daily basis around the perimeter of the café. Motion seconded by S. Edwards. The motion was carried 4-0-2, with J. Smith and J. Darrow abstaining.

50 Front St.:

Ellsworth introduces the co-applicants, Cheryl Sacco, attorney for Newman Development Group and Aaron Martin and Stacy Dunkin, President and Executive Director of Broome County Land Bank, respectively. Sacco addressed criteria for determination for historic significance for demolition (18-83) and stated that the three criteria for historic significance do not apply to this property. This assertion is further supported by John, architect from Delta, who also noted the large amount of asbestos, structural deficiencies and public safety concerns. Nobody has come forward with adaptive reuse plans with existing building; Land Bank was successful in securing state funds to do remediation of building. Broome County has also made a significant investment in property with the commission of a \$40,000 asbestos survey.

T. Costello appears to discuss concerns regarding, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Since there are state funds involved, the Determination of Historic Significance will have to be evaluated by SHPO. If SHPO does determine that the property is historically significant, it will have to be adaptively reused. Discussion ensues regarding the value, or lack thereof, of the property; the developers are convinced no one would be interested in property as is. R. Murphy questions SHPO's interpretation regarding their legal involvement despite state funds. J. Smith stated that SHPO takes the local decision into account first and foremost; J. Smith and T. Costello then submitted his research regarding important events on property. Political and social events occurred at this property and the index for the importance of events was contested.

J. Darrow makes a motion for no historical significance, seconded by S. Edwards. The motion was carried 5-1-0, with J. Smith was in opposition. The demolition was approved.

Other Business

- Time of meeting as well as duration
- Does CAUD have the right to an executive session – this has never happened in the past 8 years

- Can you use email to discuss projects?
 - Cannot make any decisions, but can have discussions
 - A public body has to act in public
- Staff attendance of meetings
- J. Darrow makes a motion that K. Ellsworth is now CAUD Chairman provided a written letter from Corporation Council indicates a ruling of no conflict of interest. S. Edwards seconded the motion. All were unanimously in favor; the motion carried 6-0-0.

Adjournment

J. Darrow makes a motion to adjourn, seconded by S. Edwards. The Commissioners voted 6-0-0.